

AN ANSWER TO THE CRITICISMS OF "CHRISTIANITY AND ITS BIBLE."

AND A DISCUSSION OF
THE BAPTIST POSITION
AND THE
QUESTION OF HONESTY

BY

PERRY J. STACKHOUSE.

A LIMITED NUMBER OF PAMPHLETS WILL BE SENT
FREE TO ANY ADDRESS BY SENDING STAMPS TO
COVER POSTAGE. ADDRESS PERRY J. STACKHOUSE,
CAMPELLTON, N. B.

An Answer to the Criticisms of "Christianity and Its Bible,"

BY

PERRY J. STACKHOUSE

INTRODUCTION

Probably no book written by any author in the Maritime Provinces has aroused more interest in religious circles than *Christianity and Its Bible*, by Rev. H. F. Waring, M. A., and published by the University of Chicago press. It has called forth hearty endorsements and glowing eulogies from many of the leading scholars and magazines on the continent. On the other hand, it has found a few opponents who have been instant in season and out of season in condemning the alleged dangerous tendencies of the book. One of the most vehement and persistent of these is Rev. E. J. Grant, of Hampton, N. B., who in a letter to the *Halifax Herald* went so far as to give as his judgment that it would be exceedingly difficult to learn from the book what Mr. Waring believes or whether he believes anything that is worth while. It seemed to the writer of this pamphlet that this statement so damaging to the book and the author should not be permitted to go unchallenged. He therefore wrote a letter to the *Herald* in which he protested against this and a few other criticisms that had been made against the book. In reply to Mr. Grant he showed that Mr. Waring in his book teaches the reality and awfulness of sin. He teaches regeneration and conversion. By regeneration meaning the coming of life from God. By conversion the corresponding flow to God. He teaches that man is saved not by morality nor by good works but by faith. He teaches that Jesus is Saviour from sin, that through the saving power of his death on the cross, man is made at one with God. He teaches the Fatherhood of God and the fact that through the aid of God the Holy Spirit and through Jesus the Son of God, man in his childhood of weakness is brought to God, the loving Father. Surely a man who believes these fundamental doctrines which were selected at random from the book, believes something that is worth while. One of three courses were now open to Mr. Grant. (1). First, to substantiate his charge. (2). To make a frank apology to Mr. Waring for a charge that was calculated to do so much injury to the book and its author. (3). To remain silent and leave the impression that he was unable to formulate a

(1)

17750.

reply that was satisfactory and unwilling to make an apology. Mr. Grant adopted the third course.

The critic having been silenced on the one charge brings other and perhaps graver charges against the book in a pamphlet of 15 pages, entitled: *A Critique of Christianity and the Bible*, by Pastor E. J. Grant. This pamphlet, advertised in the *Maritime Baptist*, is not only being circulated industriously among the members of Mr. Waring's congregation in Halifax, but is being sent to many of the ministers and laymen of the Baptist denomination in the Maritime Provinces. Mr. Grant would probably admit that the effect of the pamphlet upon the average man who has not read the book would be to prejudice him most strongly against the author of *Christianity and Its Bible*. The *Maritime Baptist*, in an editorial commenting on Mr. Grant's critique, states 'If any one reads Mr. Grant's Critique without having read Mr. Waring's book, he may not unnaturally reach the conclusion that *Christianity and Its Bible* is a book characterized by dangerous tendencies and much pernicious doctrine. Those who wish to reach an unprejudiced conclusion in the matter may with profit read both the book and the Critique.' That Mr. Grant's pamphlet is calculated to inflame and arouse a very bitter feeling against the author of *Christianity and Its Bible*, especially among those who have not read the book or who have read it hastily is undeniable. A prominent medical doctor, a member of a Baptist church in one of the towns of Nova Scotia, in a letter dated Feb. 19th, wrote me among other things the following, which I quote as showing the effect of the pamphlet upon the mind of one of our leading and intelligent laymen. 'I have received a pamphlet purporting to be a criticism of *Christianity and Its Bible*, by Pastor E. J. Grant. Careful readers with little or no knowledge of the subject will feel an injustice is being done to Mr. Waring, for upon its face it is an attack and not a critique. There are many others who will know that this so called critique completely ignores Mr. Waring's declared purpose in his book, continually avoids the primary issue raised in the first of the book and persistently misrepresents the positions taken by Mr. Waring throughout the book. There are, however, many others who will feel that this production has annihilated Mr. Waring's theology, his book and his influence, hardly leaving even a memory in their minds of his temerity in venturing to express his belief.'

Now the best reply to the pamphlet is the book itself, but as there are perhaps thousands of people who will read the pamphlet without seeing the book, the pamphlet calls for a reply and as the pamphlet gathers up all the adverse criticism that has been brought against the book

a reply to the pamphlet is a reply to all. I have undertaken the task of replying, partly because of my intimate association with Mr Waring in Christian work, partly because of my sympathy with the general aim and spirit of the book, partly because I have been urged to the work by representative men of our denomination, but most of all because of a conviction that in this age of theological reconstruction and unrest, instead of condemning harshly criticizing and grossly misrepresenting, we should thank God for men like Mr Waring, who are mediating between the specialists and the people and patiently and reverently are seeking to make faith possible to so many who somehow have drifted away from the faith of their childhood. It is not my intention to reply in detail to all the minor points raised by Mr. Grant in his pamphlet. To do so would require a pamphlet of many pages, I wish rather to discuss the Purpose of the Critic, the Spirit of the Critic and the Method of the Critic, and in closing deal with the Baptist Position and the Question of Honesty. If I am able to show that the critic has seriously misrepresented the author's position on such important doctrines as the Scriptures, the Atonement, the Virgin Birth, and the Resurrection of Christ, the intelligent reader will be inclined to discount the minor criticisms of the book. As a matter of fact, by showing the method of the critic I shall indirectly answer every criticism brought against the book.

I. THE PURPOSE OF THE CRITIC.

On the first page of the pamphlet Mr. Grant expresses his purpose. It is 'to write for publication what in our opinion are the objectionable features of the book.' It is 'to write as briefly as possible what seems to us the most unfortunate and utterly to be detested teachings of this book.' Here then we have the very frank declaration that the critic of Christianity and Its Bible, mole-eyed to everything that is true and good and beautiful in the book, is on the hunt for the objectionable, the unfortunate and the utterly to be detested. It is an honest confession that his treatment of the book is to be a one-sided treatment. It is not to look for things to praise, but for things to condemn that he scrutinizes the pages of Christianity and Its Bible. Dominated by a like purpose Robert Ingersoll, the apostle of cheap infidelity came to our Bible and upon the public platform held it up to scorn and laughter. He too, was on the hunt for what seemed to him the objectionable, the unfortunate and the utterly to be detested, and like the critic of Christianity and Its Bible, he found the things he was seeking. How impossible to have a fair judgment of any book when a

writer is dominated by such a purpose

The purpose having been indicated so frankly we are prepared for

II. THE SPIRIT OF THE CRITIC.

Athanasius, one of the early Church Fathers, called his theological opponents 'devils, antichrists, maniacs, Jews, atheists, dogs, wolves, hydras, eels, gnats, beetles and leeches.' The Christian world has made a great advance in courtesy of speech since Athanasius hurled these epithets at his theological adversaries. Most theological controversies today are free from the use of polemical billingsgate. The excited appeal to passion and prejudice and the use of derisive epithets are not tolerated within the ranks of true scholarship. It is therefore with deep regret that we find Mr. Grant using such epithets and phrases towards Mr. Waring or Christianity and Its Bible as the following— 'utterly to be detested,' 'very arrogant or very careless writer,' 'dogmatism,' 'self confident,' 'professedly Christian teacher,' 'professedly Christian minister,' 'altogether unsafe guide,' 'recklessness,' 'pernicious and utterly false,' a comparison of the book to 'Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde,' 'not the courage of his convictions,' 'the timid questionings, the lame, halting, hesitating statements,' 'the most stupid book,' 'arrogance and self complacency,' 'no sane man,' 'foolish,' A pious hope that the men in Baptist pulpits who have accepted the Method of the higher criticism may be recovered 'from this snare of the Devil,' It is perhaps fortunate for all parties concerned that Mr. Grant is living in the 20th century rather than in the Dark ages, for he has so felt the tolerant spirit of the modern world that he cannot fairly be placed in the same class with Athanasius as a maker of abusive epithets, but that he has reached that enviable quality of spirit which is sometimes known as the scientific mind, will hardly be admitted by anyone who studies the above list of words culled from his pamphlet.

In contrast to the Spirit of the Critique, it might be well to notice what other critics have said concerning the Spirit of Christianity and Its Bible. These quotations will at the same time serve to correct the epithets used by Mr Grant. President Falconer writes 'sincerity, sanity and moral earnestness.' Presbyterian Witness 'the tone is devout and reverent.' The Independent, 'it is liberal in spirit, cordial in its attitude toward historical criticism, but cautious in the acceptance of new views, and sincerely religious in temper.' The Outlook, 'a thoroughly religious spirit and an open-minded, intellectual attitude of hospitality towards all that is well accredited in modern learning, are conspicuous in the book. It is characterized by judicious and skillful condensation, fairness, common

sense and freedom from dogmatism.' The Maritime Baptist, 'It does not speak to us in muffled tones of doubt and negation, but in the clear vibrant notes of joyous and triumphant faith. It is a book which must make a strong appeal to earnest and unprejudiced minds.' The Yarmouth Herald, 'No matter how careful or brilliant a writer may be the most important thing about a volume of this kind is the spirit in which it is written. One has not proceeded very far in these pages before he is certain of the absolute honesty of the author...He has the courage of his convictions. He touches deftly and delicately on controversial matters. In biblical criticism I should classify him as a scholar with an open mind and a conservative leaning.

III. THE METHOD OF THE CRITIC

The Method of the Critic is in harmony with the purpose and spirit already expressed. It is first of all

(I). A METHOD OF MISREPRESENTATION.

It is with much reluctance and a feeling of sadness that I write these words. To charge a minister of Jesus Christ with misrepresenting a book written by a brother minister is a most serious charge. I wish to be charitable to the critic of Christianity and Its Bible and I do not claim that it was wilful misrepresentation but that he misrepresents is a fact so evident to every thoughtful reader of this pamphlet that no other word so fittingly describes the method. Let me give a few illustrations in point.

(a) On page two he states that none would be more forward than Mr. Waring himself in claiming that he has utterly discarded the generally accepted view of New Testament teaching. This point will be indirectly discussed later on in reply to other criticisms. However, a complete answer to it is that Mr. Waring does not utterly discard the generally accepted view of New Testament teaching. How Mr. Grant could make such a sweeping statement in view of the fact that his attention had been called to the fundamental doctrines held by Mr. Waring which I have quoted at the beginning of the pamphlet, passes the comprehension of the average man.

(b) On the same page he states that Mr. Waring has 'utterly discarded the generally accepted view of the Bible as an authoritative Divine revelation.' That Mr. Waring holds to the bible as an authoritative Divine Revelation can easily be shown from his book. For example, we find on page 324 the following words: 'We think you would agree with us that the bible belongs to the inspired movement of which Christianity is the religion and Jesus Christ, the bright, consummate flower; that it is an inspiring supporter of that now world-wide

movement; and that its authority is the authority of truth revealed especially in and through Jesus Christ.' On page 317 the following.—'Free from the bondage of the belief that the truth of Christianity depends upon the absolute inerrancy of the Bible and helped to the very heart of the Bible through the belief in progressive revelation we need no outside authority to prove its authority. Because it has so inspired him and he has had such a rich religious experience through its truths, he has a direct appreciation of its authority.'

c) Mr. Grant on page 3 states that he is 'reluctantly forced to the conclusion that Mr. Waring's estimate of the Scriptures is not high.' Was Mr. Grant in a day dream when he wrote these words or had he overlooked such statements and phrases as the following, scattered throughout "Christianity and its Bible?" On page 15, Mr. Waring, comparing the Bible with the especially sacred writings of other religions, writes: "The more we compare the religious conceptions revealed in it and in them, the more do we appreciate its progressive revelation..... When thus compared especially because of its revelation in and through Jesus it will be found to be beyond comparison.' On page 321 he speaks of the Bible as containing 'God's word,' and on page 315 speaks of its 'divine riches.' On page 322 he states 'The Bible is not only its own best defense, but it will win victories for truth and righteousness. The more it is known, therefore the better.' and on same page he refers to it as 'The Book of Books.' And yet Mr. Grant, true to his promise to write of the most unfortunate, and utterly to be detested teaching of the book, ignoring the true the good and the beautiful not in a moment of impassioned oratory when carried away on a flood of emotions but in the quiet of his study and in cold blood pens, the following, and sends it out on its mischief-making mission. 'Mr. Waring has utterly discarded the generally accepted view of the Bible as an authoritative divine revelation and his estimate of the Scriptures is not high.'

(d) Mr. Grant in his great eagerness to destroy the force of the many testimonials from distinguished scholars concerning the value of "Christianity and its Bible" naively suggests that when they wrote their glowing eulogies they were thinking only of the historical portions of the book. Mr. Grant himself is so stirred to a white heat of admiration as he thinks of the genius of Mr. Waring as a writer on church history, that as he takes a bird's eye view of the great historians of the ages who have written on the facts of Christianity and mentally compares their productions with Christianity and Its Bible, he bursts out enthusiastically, 'nothing better,' 'simple,' 'fascinating.' It is unfortunate that Mr. Grant overlooked the following flat-

ering testimonials of distinguished men referring to the book's treatment of theology, the bible, the practical and devotional Christian life, as well as of church history. President Falconer writes it gives 'a more intelligent view of the history, the fundamental beliefs and the problems of our religion.'

Dr. John McLean: 'I can highly recommend it as a strong and helpful book upon life, religion and theology.'

Dr. Chute: 'I believe that over this bridge many of the thoughtful will pass to a more complete and hence more profitable comprehension of what a wonderful volume a wonderful library indeed we possess in the 'Book our fathers read.'

Presbyterian Witness says it will 'Strengthen faith in God's word and illustrate anew its wondrous excellence. The chapter on the gospel and the death of Jesus are thoughtful, interesting and affecting. The closing chapters glow with tender sympathy with the man who is not Christian and who does not enjoy the peace of God.'

The Wesleyan: 'The deeper spiritual life is not forgotten and the Bible becomes to us a book to be cherished and it is better understood after a perusal of this suggestive volume. It is a book to be studied, a text book for the teacher and a help to meditation for the private Christian.'

Dr. Eaton: "Those who study the book will, I am sure, find not only enrichment for their minds, but inspiration to love and sacrifice.'

That Mr. Grant has misrepresented and seriously misrepresented Christianity and Its Bible will be apparent to anyone reading the above list which I have given as illustrative of his method. Many other examples could be given if necessary. But the most serious thing in the criticism of Christianity and Its Bible is not the fact that it is a method of misrepresentation, serious though it is. The thing which is most serious and which almost seems like a sin against light and knowledge is the fact that the critic of Christianity and Its Bible

(2) ABSOLUTELY IGNORES THE PURPOSE

OF THE AUTHOR.

That purpose is not only clearly stated in the book itself but the author in reply to the few persistent critics who have attacked the book in the public press, has called attention to it again and again. It is deeply significant that in all the adverse criticisms of the book there has been a complete failure to recognize the purpose of the author. I have a feeling that if Mr. Grant had reviewed the book in the light of its purpose he would have written not a scathing critique but a commendation of the book. This leads me to

THE PURPOSE OF THE AUTHOR.

In the preface page IX this purpose is clearly stated.

'In the preparation of this book the purpose has been to help meet the need presented in the last chapter—the chapter concerning 'clear-eyed middle men between the specialists and the ordinary readers' And on page 319 in discussing the ideal middle-man he uses the following language:—'By using what is common to both the older and newer views of truth, he makes the transition from the errors of the old as easy as possible. He aims for the minimum of critical processes and the maximum of helpful results. Nevertheless he keeps in mind that many to-day including so many Sabbath-school teachers, need instruction not only in the matter of the Bible, but even more in the method and means of interpreting it for themselves.' And in his introduction to Part IV, page 221, which is theological, he writes, 'The aim of Part IV which begins with this chapter is not to give a complete system of theology but rather to give helpful points of view from which to judge the different theological questions; to give the most important of the beliefs that may be said to be established; and to give most attention to that which will make most for a holy, helpful, joyous life.' And on page 316 and 317, in discussing the middleman needed, he writes, "He has not simply read about the specialists nor merely read them, but has so studied them that he knows what they, as individuals, think is possible, what probable and what established. By a careful comparison of their many opinions he is able to distinguish between what is and what may be commonly held by them.'

Now, this purpose is so clearly stated that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. It means two things. (a) In the language of the author replying to a criticism in which that purpose had been ignored, 'The book aims to give the great truths held in common by both conservation and liberal scholars; and so to be a book that both classes could recommend as common ground on which to discuss the questions at issue between them.'

(b) It means not a manual of theology. If one comes to Christianity and Its Bible with the expectation of finding a full discussion of the various doctrines of Christianity, he will be disappointed. It is not to elaborate theories of Inspiration, Atonement, Christology, and Eschatology that Mr. Waring has written his book. It is rather 'to give helpful points of view from which to judge the different theological questions.'

In considering the purpose of Christianity and Its Bible it is well to remember that it is a book published by the University of Chicago Press in the Constructive Bible Studies, and, as stated in the preface, "is a book for Sabbath school superintendents, teachers and older classes for Y. M. C. Associations and such societies, and for thoughtful readers generally.' The book is being studied in schools

and churches in which there are men of widely different denominational and theological tendencies. If the book is to accomplish its mission it must indeed emphasize the great truths of Christianity, the things which are most surely believed among us, but it must avoid particular theories over which there is honest difference of opinion among evangelical scholars and must be on its guard against confusing the essentials of Christianity with the things which are nonessential, important though they may be. That Mr. Waring has succeeded in his purpose is evident in that the book has called forth strong commendations from men representing practically every Protestant denomination. Here in the Maritime provinces the Presbyterian Witness and the Wesleyan have gone even farther than the Maritime Baptist in their eulogies of the book.

Mr. Grant, because he has ignored the purpose of the book, has completely misrepresented the author's position in reference to almost every doctrine of Christianity upon which he touches. Take three of the most important doctrines as examples in point.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH.

Mr. Grant concludes after a page of most questionable interpretation that the author of Christianity and Its Bible is teaching that there is nothing supernatural about the birth of Christ and that he is therefore a man and nothing more. It may be said first of all that

(1) . . THIS IS A STRIKING CASE OF NON SEQUITUR

Mr. Waring in his historical treatment of Jesus as the Christ, considers the testimony of Scriptures and of Christ Himself, concerning his claims. He shows that the prologue of the Fourth Gospel teaches the pre-existence and the Incarnation of the Word, but is silent concerning the Virgin birth; that the Virgin birth is taught in the first and third gospels, but is not mentioned by Jesus nor Philipians, which teaches the pre-existence and self-emptying of Christ. By the same historical method which is the method of all scholars, conservative as well as liberal, Mr. Waring deals with Jesus, as Son of Man, and Jesus, as Son of God. But because Mr. Waring in his historical treatment of Jesus, as the Christ, mentions the simple fact that the Virgin Birth is taught only in the first and third Gospels, the critic of the book jumps to the conclusion that the book denies the Virgin Birth. Surely a remarkable conclusion, but one in harmony with the critic's purpose, spirit and method.

(2) IGNORING THE PURPOSE OF THE BOOK.

But the critic fails also in recognizing the purpose of the book which was to give the fundamental the great truths held in common by both conservative and liberal scholars to put first things first. There are many evangel-

ical scholars today who recognize the difficulty of establishing historically the supernatural birth of Christ. Take as a representative scholar Dr. Andrew C. Zenos, of the McCormick Theological Seminary. Writing in reply to the question, 'Is the supernatural birth of Christ historical?', he gives this as his conclusion. 'Evidently the case cannot be said to be capable of demonstration, but neither is it susceptible of disproof. Some minds will always find difficulty in giving their assent to the assertion of its reality. A vastly large number will find as they have found in the past no more difficulty with it than with the miraculous element in the gospel history in general.' Now there are many scholars who feel that to make the supernatural birth of Christ essential to Christianity is to make Christianity depend upon something that cannot today be established historically nor verified in Christian experience. Dr. Rush Rhees, the eminent Baptist President of Rochester University, in a recent magazine article, in reply to the question, 'Is the supernatural birth essential to Christianity?' answers the question in the negative. He shows in his article that the Virgin birth exercised no influence over the thought and teaching of the writers of the New Testament outside of the chapter in Matthew and Luke in which it is preserved to us. Consequently it cannot be regarded as essential to apostolic thinking. He also shows that the Virgin Birth is not essential to the most exalted Christology. He applies that to the Sinlessness and Pre-existence of Christ and shows that neither sinlessness nor pre-existence depend upon Virgin Birth.

Now Mr. Waring in harmony with his clearly stated purpose to give the fundamentals the great truths held in common by both conservative and liberal scholars as a middle-man neither affirms nor denies the historicity of the Supernatural Birth. But that he is a firm believer in the Incarnation, that Jesus is God, manifest in the flesh, and that in Him God has entered into the life of humanity, the great truth which lies back of the Supernatural Birth is evident in that he quotes with approval the words from Dr. Clarke, the great Baptist teacher at Colgate, 'All this suggests that the question of physical methods how God got Himself embodied is far less important than the ethical and spiritual question how God got Himself so marvellously expressed.' I have no doubt that the author of Christianity and Its Bible goes farther than the book on the subject of Virgin Birth that while recognizing the critical problem involved and while refusing to make the doctrine of the Virgin Birth essential to Christianity, nevertheless is in hearty agreement with the words of Dr. Rush Rhees, 'The person of Christ is a subject filled with the highest mystery and holiest significance. For many of us a Virgin Birth seems an altogether suitable intro-

duction of such a personality into our human fellowship.'
THE ATONEMENT.

The critic of Christianity and Its Bible adopts the same method in dealing with the author's position on the Atonement that he did with the author's position on the Virgin Birth.

(1) AGAIN A STRIKING CASE OF A NON SEQUITUR

On pages 9 and 10 Mr. Grant represents Mr. Waring as not allowing for a moment that there was any element of actual sacrifice in the death of Christ and as grossly misrepresenting the orthodox belief on the subject. Both statements are incorrect. Mr. Grant in support of his contention quoted the following from Christianity and Its Bible, 'Let not therefore the erroneous idea of actual sacrifice that was condemned by these passages return in the figure of sacrifice as applied to Christ's death no matter by whom the figure may be used.' Why did Mr. Grant not finish the quotation? Was it through an intellectual failure to grasp the meaning of the passage? Or was it because the quotation would destroy his contention? The quotation continued, reads, 'Let the modern prophets inveigh against any figurative use of the death of Christ as a sacrifice that in any way works against the most strenuous endeavour for righteousness, mercy and humble walking with God.' As a modern prophet Mr. Waring, like Old Testament prophets, inveighs against sacrifice as a substitute for righteousness. He seeks to give the much needed warning against a subtle and dwarfing antinomianism. How far that is from denying any actual sacrifice in the death of Christ. I leave the readers of this pamphlet to judge.

(2) IGNORING THE PURPOSE OF THE BOOK.

Again the critic ignores the purpose of the book which was to give the fundamental the great truths held in common by both Conservative and Liberal scholars. There is today perhaps no doctrine of Christianity concerning which there is greater diversity of opinion than the doctrine of the Atonement. Among the theories held by Conservative as well as Liberal scholars are the following:—the Governmental, the Substitutionary, the Moral Influence, the Intuitional and variation of all these.

The author, true to his purpose, does not identify the Atonement with any particular theory of the Atonement, but seeks to emphasize the truth common to all of them. That he goes farther than the book is evident from the following reply to one of his critics: 'As is very plainly declared in it, this book is not a theological treatise and so is not my full confession of faith and should not be treated as if it were. For instance, while not a word in my book is contrary to my own belief the truth is that my own belief on the Atonement goes farther (and according to the

Scriptures too,) than is given in the book.'

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

The critic of Christianity and Its Bible adopts the same method of dealing with the author's position on the Resurrection that he did on the Virgin Birth and the Atonement.

(1) AGAIN A STRIKING CASE OF A NON SEQUITUR

He quotes from Christianity and Its Bible the following: 'Prominent in the message of the early church was the belief in the Resurrection of Jesus. Whatever may have happened at the grave and in the matter of appearances, to inspire with this belief, one thing is certain. This grave was the birthplace of the indestructible belief that death is vanquished and there is a life eternal. The life of Jesus was such that he could not die.' From this Mr. Grant draws the amazing conclusion that the only fair inference from the passage is that, Mr. Waring does not accept the doctrine of the bodily or physical resurrection of Christ.' By what strange mental process Mr. Grant was able to reach this astonishing conclusion passes the comprehension of the writer of this pamphlet. And yet as one reviews the purpose of the critic as expressed by himself in his pamphlet, the spirit which actuated him, and his method of misrepresentation, an answer may possibly be suggested.

(2) IGNORING THE PURPOSE OF THE AUTHOR.

Mr. Grant again ignores the purpose of the author, which was to give the great truths held in common by both conservative and liberal scholars. What is the great truth in the doctrine of the Resurrection of Christ shared by scholars of both classes? Is it not the truth that Jesus lives, having conquered death and brought life and immortality to light? Mr. Waring in his brief statement concerning the Resurrection of Christ emphasizes this truth. Though doubtless he recognizes with practically all the biblical scholars today the difficulty of harmonizing the accounts of the resurrection he recognizes the truth in these accounts.

The writer of this pamphlet is a firm believer in the Resurrection of Christ and makes it prominent in his preaching. He cannot account for early Christianity, for the testimony of the disciples, for the change in the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first day of the week, for the testimony of Paul that at the time he wrote his epistle to the Corinthians there were nearly 500 people still living who professed to have seen the Risen Christ save on the supposition that in some way Jesus manifested Himself to his disciples and convinced them that he was still alive. While holding thus strongly to the Resurrection it does not seem to the writer of this pamphlet to be a matter of great moment whether it was with physical or with spiritual body that Christ manifested himself to his disciples.

There are some lines of evidence which point strongly to a physical resurrection. Then there are other considerations, which points to a spiritual appearance. Probably Christian scholarship and evangelical Christian scholarship will never be in full agreement on this subject.

Mr. Waring in dealing between the specialists and the people and without casting any reflection on either of the positions mentioned has given us the truth common to both. Dr. John Watson (Ian McLaren) in his chapter on the Ageless Life, touches the question of the Resurrection of Christ in very much the same way that Mr. Waring touches it in his chapter on the Hereafter. 'How can one be certain that Jesus is with God? It is a question of the last importance. There are four lines of proof. The first is to lead reliable evidence that Jesus rose from Joseph's tomb—that is for a lawyer. The second is historical—the existence of the Christian church—that is for a scholar. The third is mystical—the experiences of Christians—that is for a saint. The fourth is ethical—the nature of Jesus' life—that is for everyone. The last is the most akin to the mind of Jesus who was accustomed to insist on the self-evidencing power of his life. He is alive because he could not die. I am the resurrection and the life.'

As with the Virgin Birth, the Atonement and the Resurrection of Christ so with other questions. Take for instance that of man's consciousness of sin. Pastor Grant's treatment of Mr. Waring's words concerning this, is also a non sequitur and ignores the purpose of the book. Pastor Grant asserts that Mr. Waring teaches what he does not teach. The book does not contradict the teaching either of specialist in the comparative study of religion or of conservative scholars in their belief in the Fall. Space does not permit further consideration of the ways in which the purpose of the book is ignored and the positions misrepresented. Space does not permit even mentioning the many unproved assertions in Mr. Grant's critique. His reference, however, to evolution is so characteristic that it might be given perhaps as undue prominence as a striking illustration of an unproved assertion.

MR. GRANT ON EVOLUTION.

On page 3 Mr. Grant states 'that the evolutionary theory never managed to get itself evolved beyond the hypothesis stage. And that most of the foremost scientists of today regard even the hypothesis as exploded beyond the possibility of repair.' It would be interesting to know what authority Mr. Grant had for making such a startling statement. So far as I have been able to discover, the scientific journals are as yet silent concerning it. I have heard no echoes of it in the daily press. It will come as a great surprise to men like Sir Archibald Geikie, one of the greatest, if not the greatest, geologists of the day

who writes, 'The doctrine of evolution has now obtained the assent of the great majority of naturalists all over the globe.' Or to Dr. George Harris, President of Amherst College, who in 1896 writes, 'One dominant factor in the thought without a doubt, is evolution, which thirty years ago was a theory advocated by a few biologists and opposed by others, but which is now adopted by all scientists and accepted by the vast majority of educated men. A generation ago it was an hypothesis, presented in scientific treatises and in technical terms. Today it is taught in the colleges, illustrated in magazines, popularized on the platform and recognized even in the pulpits. Exploded hypothesis!!! If it were necessary I could give a dozen quotations similar to the two already quoted.

It may be of interest to Mr. Grant as a Baptist to read that a conservative Baptist historian in an article on 'Recent Changes in the Theology of the Baptists' writes of President Strong's 'frank acceptance of the evolution philosophy and that President Wood of Newton Baptist Theological Seminary seemingly accepts the theory of evolution in the realm of biology and admits that many new questions regarding the origin of evil..... have been raised thereby.' Exploded hypothesis!!!

Note.—Mr. Grant may possibly be ignorant of the fact that for a man to avow himself an evolutionist does not necessarily imply that he believes man was descended from a rock or crystal, or even from an anthropoid ape.

SUMMARY.

Mr. Waring has written a book and Mr. Grant has written a criticism of the book. In offering his book to the public Mr. Waring might naturally expect criticism and as a lover of truth ought indeed to welcome it. The truest friend an author or preacher can have is the man who points out his mistakes. But when a man undertakes to criticize a book he should come to it with an unprejudiced mind. He should be careful in imputing motives to the writer and should cultivate courtesy in speech. He should take into consideration the purpose of the author and in pointing out the errors of the book should also dwell upon the truths it contains. He should be absolutely fair to the author and his conclusions should be fully warranted by the facts. In all cases where there might be a doubt as to the meaning of the author he certainly should give the author the benefit of the doubt. To what extent has the critic of Christianity and Its Bible been in harmony with these cardinal rules for criticism I think I have shown to the satisfaction of any fair minded reader that Mr. Grant has completely violated them. He has written, not a criticism, but a tirade. I have shown quoting from the pamphlet itself that his purpose was to write 'What in our opinion are the

objectionable features of the book,' 'to write as briefly as possible what seems to us the most unfortunate and utterly to be detested teaching of the book'—a frank confession that his treatment of the book was to be a one-sided treatment. I have shown the unfortunate spirit of the critic by quoting from the pamphlet a long list of derisive epithets drawn from the vocabulary of obloquy, which he applies either to the author or to the book. I have shown that his method of criticism was a method of misrepresentation and in support of my contention have given a few illustrations from the many that might be given if necessary. I have shown that the whole criticism against Christianity and Its Bible breaks down from the simple fact that he has ignored the purpose of the author. This has led him to misrepresent the author's position on almost every doctrine of Christianity upon which he touches. As examples in point I have shown how this failure has led him to misrepresent the author's position in reference to the Atonement, the Virgin Birth, and the Resurrection of Christ. That a pamphlet dominated by such a purpose and such a spirit and such a method with its appeal to passion and prejudice should be circulated so widely among the Baptists of the Maritime Provinces is greatly to be regretted.

IV. THE BAPTIST POSITION AND THE QUESTION OF HONESTY

MR. WARING AND THE FIRST BAPTIST

CHURCH OF HALIFAX.

The most serious thing about Mr. Grant's critique is that which it went out of its way to do. Mr. Waring's book (designed as it was for the use of all denominations) is undenominational. The Presbyterian Witness said, 'It is thoroughly Catholic without a taint of sectarianism.' The Yarmouth Herald stated: 'So faithful has he been to the largest conception of truth that I defy any man to guess of what denomination he belongs. This is decidedly to his credit.' Despite this fact, Mr. Grant's pamphlet professes to be a critique of the book. In its last chapter (its climax it would seem) reflects against Mr. Waring's honor and honesty in continuing to be a pastor of a Baptist church. It implies that Mr. Waring was dishonorable in going to the First Baptist Church of Halifax and using in the way he did 'that plant and the opportunity and the prestige which it gave him.'

I regret that Mr. Grant has found it necessary to raise the question of honor and honesty in the relation of Mr. Waring to the church which he serves as pastor. And I regret still more the necessity of a reply to his criticism.

Neither of us are able to write from first hand information and our attitude toward Mr. Waring will be pretty largely determined by the source from which we receive our information. Mr. Grant indeed in his pamphlet makes the surprising confession 'that he has no knowledge whatever of how matters stand in Mr. Waring's church'. Why then did Mr. Grant raise the local issue and reflect not only against the honor and honesty of Mr. Waring, but also against the honor and honesty of the First Baptist Church 'in using a valuable plant that was created for an entirely different purpose and that is an embodiment of entirely different conceptions and beliefs.' It may seem a matter of small moment to the critic of Christianity and its Bible to reflect against the honor and honesty of a brother minister and a church which has played a rather important part in the history of our denomination, but even the common law of the country is inclined to take a rather more serious view of such charges.

That Mr. Waring's congregation resents the attack made upon its honor is evident in the following quotation: from a letter which I received on Feb. 24th from a prominent member of the First Baptist Church: '**Personally I believe that Mr. Grant's circular is unjust and harmful; and while he is within his rights to criticize Christianity and its Bible yet I feel he is certainly not entitled to raise any questions regarding the First Baptist Church. I presume the members of the First Baptist Church are capable of managing their own affairs.**'

The writer of this pamphlet having conducted two series of evangelistic services in the First Baptist Church of Halifax, and having talked with a large number of the members of that church on the theological situation is able to write with more authority than the critic of Christianity and its Bible who 'has no knowledge whatever of how matters stand.'

The truth is that the history of Mr. Waring's relation with the Church in Halifax, instead of reflecting against his honesty shows how his very desire to be honest and honorable occasioned the opposition and criticism he has met. Recognizing as a Baptist that his church had no creed and as a consequence made much of the Bible, he saw that the question of the right method of Bible study was fundamental. His own method as he shows in the book, was to get to the truth through the thought of the writers and the facts in and back of their thought. The first step in this method was to get each author's meaning without assuming that it was absolutely without mistake. This was the method of most Baptist scholars but not of most Baptists. He knew that to mediate between the scholars and the people meant to bear the cross. He felt, however, that he would not be

honest unless he did attempt to mediate in this fundamental question of the method of Bible study. He therefore preached several sermons, in which he stated his method and in his large Bible class he began to apply it. He was strongly opposed by the assumption and assertion that the Bible was absolutely without mistake, at least in the original text, and that it ought to be studied with that assumption. That this was the primary issue raised against him has been clearly shown in the public press.

In the discussion that followed he showed how the prominent Baptist theologians, President Strong and Hovey who once defended the absolute inerrancy of the Bible withdrew from their text books in later years even the assertion of it. He also quoted the words of the British Weekly concerning the Baptist hero, Rev. John Clifford: 'Dr. Clifford, commenting on the fact that some people still claim absolute inerrancy for the Bible, replied that Martin Luther and Calvin did not take this position. The claim of inerrancy came into existence some time after the Reformation, when it was used to repudiate the claims of the Roman Catholics to the inerrancy of the church.' He also quoted from the 'foremost New Testament scholar' among Baptists, Prof. E. D. Burton: 'A false reverence may demand that we ignore the possibility of any error in the Biblical narrative. But a true reverence will set truth above theory and presupposition.'

Mr. Waring might indeed have learned from many other Baptist scholars. Dr. Faunce, President of Brown University writes: 'We can no longer regard the laws of Deuteronomy as binding on us, or the morality of the Old Testament as complete. We no longer look to the Bible for our astronomy, geology, or even for our psychology.' Dr. William N. Clarke, Professor of systematic theology at Colgate University, denies the inerrancy of the Scriptures. Dr. Nathan E. Wood, the present president of Newton Theological Seminary, who undoubtedly would be classed as a conservative in his point of view of theology, speaks of the theory of verbal inspiration universally held by Baptists at the beginning of the nineteenth century as 'crass' and as having barred 'the way against any inquiry into the grounds of authority. Baptists now appear to accept the authority of the Scriptures chiefly because of the Christian consciousness of their eternal fitness to be the words of God..... The real and ultimate grounds of acceptance are the affirmations of Christian consciousness. The verbal theory itself has been so modified as to allow for the free play of the human element in inspired utterance.'

From these quotations and many more that might be given it is evident that the most prominent of the Baptist scholars today no longer hold to the absolute

inerrancy of the Bible. Pastor Grant does not defend or even assert it in his critique. It is very evident that Mr. Waring has won out on the primary issue that was raised against him. This is 'far-reaching in importance involving the entire shifting of the basis of authority from an external and dogmatic basis to one which is spiritual and inherent.' Because of its importance it has been dwelt upon at considerable length in this pamphlet. Because of its importance it was given a prominent place at the beginning of Christianity and Its Bible. Because of its importance it should not have been avoided the way it has been by the critics of the author of that book. They should acknowledge that he has won and should fairly face what his victory involves. Until they do, their attacks upon him will not appear to be for the sake of the truth and nothing but the truth.

At the risk of a little repetition let us thoroughly understand the situation. Because Baptists are 'without a creed recognized as authoritative and binding, without ecclesiastical courts for the enforcement of uniformity in doctrine and practice on churches and ministers' and because they make so much of the Bible the question of a right method of Bible study is a fundamental one. Recognizing this Mr. Waring's honesty compelled him (dispite the temporary opposition which it would arouse) to mediate between Baptist specialists and ordinary Baptists in the question of a right method of Bible study. He has won in the primary issue raised against him. Yet his critics instead of manfully acknowledging that he was right, have in many ways avoided the primary issue that was raised in 1903. They have used false analogies concerning it, they have tried to change it, and they have tried to drown it in appeals of denominationalism.

After years of prayerful, careful study, Mr. Waring published his book to meet the great need of mediating between specialists and ordinary readers. Not a sentence in his book has been shown or can be shown to be contrary to the Baptist faith. Yet a few persistent Baptist critics have raised the denominational cry against it. In so doing they have refused to see it in the light of its declared purpose and refused in the light of frequent requests that they so view it. Not only this but they frequently have mis presented the positions taken in the book and read into different passages meanings that were not there. Even when professing to review the book they have ignored the tribute to its worth in the fact that it was adopted into the Constructive Bible Study series and put into the adult division to which President Harper and Professor E. D. Burton were the other contributors. They have endeavored to minimize the worth of the strong and glowing words concerning it that were written by

the ablest scholars and educational leaders on the continent.

Mr. Waring's congregation recognizes that he has won in the primary issue raised against him and that he has tried in vain to get his critics honestly to acknowledge it and fairly face what it involves. It must recognize that until his critics do this they have no right to raise questions in the settlement of which the Bible must be used. It must recognize that when they do this, Mr. Waring with the same honesty and courage that have won in the first issue, is ready to meet any attack that is made in the open. Again and again, it has given him special and costly tokens of its appreciation of the courageous honesty back of his efforts to be a 'clear-eyed middleman.' It must recognize that as such he is not a mere teller, but a teacher, whose statements and questions are designed to stimulate the people to think for themselves. It knows that he did not accept his method of Bible study without a struggle. It has read what he wrote concerning this struggle and the result in making the Bible a richer book than before. Stating that he once held the old view of Bible study, he wrote:

'I had been taught that it was Hobson's choice—this view of the Bible or no Bible at all. For a time it seemed the end would be no Bible at all. It was a sad experience. In my despondency and doubt I came in touch with the writings of those Christian scholars who did not hold the traditional view and yet believed in the Bible as the Word of God. It was, then, no Hobson's choice, after all. With their aid and God's grace, I faced the issue. The result was that the Bible became richer to me than before, because it gave me a more real, living revelation of God.

My prayer and resolve since have been to help the increasing number who cannot accept the traditional view, and also the many others who would be enriched by accepting a better view. I have deep sympathy, however, especially for the old people who are pained at any questioning of the old view. I can understand how some of them can think that a man who does not assume that the Bible is inerrant is not honorable if he remain in the Baptist ministry. I try to remember that the responsibility for tolerance rests with those who have the wider vision.'

'Is there a question of honor and honesty?' asks Mr. Grant's critique. If there is then we submit, in view of what we have written, that it is a question of the honor and honesty of Mr. Waring's critics who have misrepresented him and the positions taken in his book, have ignored its purpose, have avoided the primary issue and what it involves, and have sought to submerge the issue of the book and Mr. Waring himself in the waters of

denominational prejudice. Baptist, as he is, he emerges to newness of life in applying his true method of Bible study—the method that he presents at the beginning of his book.

So much for the local situation in Halifax and the question of honor and honesty raised by Mr. Grant in his pamphlet. It leads naturally to

(2) THE LARGER ISSUE OF THE BAPTIST POSITION AND THE QUESTION OF HONESTY.

The attack made upon the author of Christianity and Its Bible, with the denominational cry, its appeal to ancient standards, and the question of honor involved, has more than a local significance. There are other Baptist ministers in these provinces who have been exposed to the same attacks, and there are many others who, having accepted the modern method, know not when the storm may burst upon them. The young men graduating from our theological seminaries, who have adopted the modern position are interested. The churches of the provinces is sorely in need of men—trained men—and almost every issue of our denominational paper has in it a Macedonian cry for the Canadian young men graduating from seminaries across the border to return and serve Canadian churches. Some of these may hesitate in responding to the cry, if they discover that the heresy hunt is abroad in the land and what Pope Pius X is seeking to do in the Catholic world in his encyclical against modernism, a few Baptist (Popes would be an uncharitable word to use) are seeking to do in the Baptist. In considering this larger issue we may be helped to a solution of the problem by frankly facing a few facts.

(a) The first is that Baptists have no creed but accept the Bible as an authoritative Divine Revelation. The significance of that fact has already been pointed out in discussing the local situation.

(b) The second fact is that there has been among Baptists a constant development in doctrine. A reviewer of Veder's History of the Baptist's writes: 'It is evident that in their history Baptists have passed through all sorts of changes and in present day discussions on disputed points in policy and doctrine the appeal to precedent and antiquity is of slightest value.' Prof. Albert H. Newman, D. D., LL. D., of Baylor University, Waco, Texas, the distinguished Baptist historian writes: 'From the Apostolic time to the present there has never been complete agreement among Baptists (antipedobaptists) and no half century has elapsed it is probable in the history of any particular antipedobaptist party without changes more or less marked in doctrine or in practice.'

We have a very excellent illustration of the progress of doctrine and policy among the Baptists of the Maritime

Provinces in the recent union of the former Free Baptist and Baptist denominations in one United Baptist body. We have buried the old issues over which the Fathers fought and have come together because of a recognition that there are no questions of conscience keeping us apart.

(c) The third fact is that Baptists today are by no means an unit in their doctrinal position. That fact is so evident that it needs no proof. There has grown up in the great Baptist body two parties more or less clearly defined and known variously as conservatives and liberals, or by the more opprobrious titles of Traditionalist and New Theology men. A mere statement of these three facts is sufficient to settle the question of honor and honesty. A liberal has just as much right in a Baptist pulpit as a conservative, and indeed, his preaching may be more in harmony with present day Baptist beliefs as taught in our leading Baptist Universities and seminaries than the preaching of the conservative.

In view of these facts which are so self evident that they will not be questioned by either party, two very important questions arise for the consideration of Baptists. First, what have Baptists today in common, and wherein do they differ? Second, what shall be the attitude of the one party to the other?

AGREEMENTS AND DIFFERENCES AMONG BAPTISTS

The late Eri B. Hulbert, DD., LL. D., the eminent Baptist historian and a man able to speak with authority on present day tendencies among the Baptists writing in the Baptist Standard in 1897 has sums up the agreements and differences among the Baptists:

'Party lines do not divide us and are not likely to on what are commonly accepted as our distinctive principles. All Baptists believe and will probably continue to believe in immersion, believer's baptism, a regenerate church membership, the memorial character of the Lord's supper, local church independency, separation of church and state, soul liberty. Perhaps increasing numbers suspect that while in theory the Baptists are stout believers in soul liberty there is no denomination harder on its members if they are rash enough to exercise it. Party lines do not divide us and are not likely to on the great fundamental saving and moral truths of Christianity. When all non-essentials are stripped away and all is reduced to original simplicity and necessity Baptists in the future as in the past will confess a common creed. They have never questioned any primary saving and morally essential truth of the gospel and they show no disposition to do so.'

'Troubles begin to appear and divisive opinions to arise when we enter the domain of metaphysics, of speculative philosophy, of historical inquiry, of dogmatic theology, of

scientific discovery, of literary criticism. Here the Baptists are no longer one. In our ranks the division is less apparent than in some other denominations, but it is no less real. The lines are being drawn and the party spirit is gaining strength. Already the things in which we disagree are being more talked about and emphasized than those greater things in which we stand together.' I think the readers of this pamphlet will feel that Dr. Hulbert has given us a fair and unprejudiced statement of the agreements and differences existing among the Baptists of today. Recognizing therefore, that Baptists are one in their distinctive principles and in the essentials of Christianity and that the differences arise when we enter the 'domain of metaphysics, of speculative philosophy, of historical inquiry, of dogmatic theology, of scientific discovery, of literary criticism,' the important question arises.

WHAT SHALL BE THE ATTITUDE

OF THE ONE PARTY TO THE OTHER?

(1) They can magnify their differences and enter upon a war of extermination using whatever weapons may best accomplish their ends. The liberal can represent the conservative as a sort of Ostrich Fool, who puts his head in the sands lest he should get a vision of the truth and be converted and live. He can cast reflections on his scholarship and industry and paint a graphic picture of him as a Rip Van Winkle, who has just awakened out of a prolonged slumber to find himself in a changed world and is anxious to bring back the days of the tallow candle and the stage coach. He can speak of him as a Foe of Liberty, a Brake on the Wheels of Progress and compare him to certain Pharisees and Saducees and priests and cardinals and various other historical personages, who made it uncomfortable for the heretics of their day. The Conservative, on his part, can heap ridicule and contempt on the liberal. He can represent him as a demagogue, a breeder of trouble, a wrecker of the Christian faith. He can wield the ecclesiastical sword and excite his denomination against him by popular appeals to passion and prejudice. He can paint a picture of him as a Wolf in Sheep's Clothing, who has crept into a Baptist pulpit and is using that pulpit to rend and scatter the flock. The liberal can caricature the doctrines held by the conservative, and the conservative can distort and misrepresent the message of the liberal. Each can scheme and canvass and cultivate a spirit of low political craft whereby resolution may be passed condemning the doctrines of the other. They can carry their warfare into the public press, into the denominational papers and at associations and convention gatherings until a scoffing public will say, not as did the heathen: 'Behold how these Christians love one another,' but 'Behold how they fight.'

(2) On the other hand, Liberals and Conservatives, instead of magnifying their differences, can put new emphasis on the things which they hold in common. The Conservative, recognizing the fact that down through the centuries, there has been a constant development in doctrine that indeed the heterodoxy of one age to a later age is frequently the faith of the Fathers, can subscribe to the sentiments expressed by John Robinson, when he declared to the Pilgrim Fathers as they were just about to sail on the momentous voyage across the Atlantic: **'that the Lord has more truth and light yet to break out of his holy word.'** The Liberals too, can recognize the fact that the conservatives have often saved the church from heresy which if successful, would have been fatal to pure and evangelical Christianity. These facts will lead both to cultivate a spirit of charity and Christian courtesy. As Baptists, and therefore believers in the great principle of soul liberty, we will be tolerant of those whose opinions do not exactly coincide with our own. A distinguished Baptist historian puts it thus strongly:

'The Baptists have taught the other denominations - and the Christian world what toleration is and now we will not violate the letter and spirit of it against our own brethren. In every decade of our history we have suffered in some part of the world from the intolerant spirit of professed disciples of Christ. We have felt the injustice of it. We have protested against the iniquity of it. We have warned our adversaries that they would never win their cause by the exercise of it. Today we stand before the world as the triumphant champions and defenders of toleration.' and **'today we will not belie our antecedents by turning with intolerant zeal against our own brethren, who happen to be so unfortunate as to be poorer theologians than ourselves.'** This does not involve a cowardly silence on disputed questions either on the part of liberal or conservative. Let the liberal fearlessly deliver the message of truth that has been given to him of God and let the conservative as fearlessly rebuke what seems to him the errors of modern thought. Surely the Baptist denomination is big enough and broad enough to have in it men of different types of theological thought. The conservative is needed to keep the denomination from going too fast and the liberal is needed to keep it from standing still. The frankest discussion of all interpretation of doctrine and policy over which there are differences of opinion among us will be of value in promoting a knowledge of the truth, but let the discussion be carried on in a spirit of charity and Christian courtesy. The man who enters into personalities and raises denominational cries and adopts a method of misrepresentation and seeks to label his opponents with some unpopular name, is not only exhibiting an unchristian

spirit, but is exposing himself to the suspicion that he is not as much interested in defending the truth as in defending his prejudices.

This pamphlet is sent out with the hope that it will remove some of the misconceptions concerning Christianity and Its Bible and at the same time lead to a better spirit in the discussion of some of the points of differences, among Baptists to-day. The spirit of "Christianity and Its Bible" we have shown to be excellent. We have also shown that it is designed to be and is a book that both liberal and conservative Baptist leaders could recommend to the people as common ground on which to proceed to the consideration of the questions at issue between the liberal and conservative scholars to-day. In the name of fair play let it be treated as such.

Since writing the above I find that the American Institute of Sacred Literature has put "Christianity and Its Bible" at the beginning of the latest of its "Popular Courses for Laymen." In these 'courses the effort is made to acquaint the reader with the best recent literature upon some subject connected with religious education from the pedagogical, ethical or biblical point of view.' This means that the book is recommended by the scholarship of Council of Seventy which "does not stand for any theory of interpretation, or school of criticism, or denomination; but for a definite endeavor to promote the knowledge of the Word of God as interpreted in the best light of to-day." It will be of interest to Mr. Waring's many friends to learn that this council includes among its members a dozen or so of the ablest Baptist Presidents and Professors on the continent and among its associate members a still larger number of Baptist scholars. Among those President Strong writes that **'the reading of Christianity and its Bible by laymen will be an educating and improving process.'** And President Faunce writes, 'I heartily hope the work will have wide circulation.' The title page of "Christianity and Its Bible" says it is "A Text-book and for Private Reading." As a text-book for adult classes it has been adopted into the constructive Bible study series. As a book for private reading by laymen it is recommended by the eminent scholarship of the Council of Seventy. It is evident the author's purpose was a good one and that it has been carried out successfully. I rejoice in his success.

Campbellton, March 5th., 1908.

“Christianity and Its Bible.”

**“It is better to see with one's own eyes than with
the eyes of other people.”---Luther.**

***Nearly 400 Pages
and Yet Only \$1.00,***

**and that, too, FREE FROM BOTH POSTAGE
AND DUTY.**

**THE PRESBYTERIAN WITNESS says: “It is really a
\$1.50 book. This will insure a large circulation.”**

Very Good Terms to Agents

**Send orders (with money enclosed) and write for Agents’
Terms to the General Agent,**

G. Blackadar,

33 Harvey St.,

Halifax, N. S.

**THE MORNING GRAPHIC PRINT
CAMPELLTON, N. B.**